REMARKS

An excess claim fee payment letter is submitted herewith for one (1) additional claim.

Claims 1-36 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claim 36 has been added.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants' representative would like to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended in the telephone interview conducted on December 13, 2007.

Applicants submit this Statement to comply with the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

In the interview, the following was discussed:

A.   **Identification of claims discussed:**

Claims 1, 17, and 26.

B.   **Identification of prior art discussed:**

Gunn et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0210402; hereinafter "Gunn").

C.   **Identification of principal proposed amendments:**

None.

D.   **Brief Identification of principal arguments:**

Applicants' representative respectfully pointed out that Gunn does not teach or suggest "*a button change section including an in-group button changing operation unit*

adapted to change the button to be focused from one button to another within the button group, and an inter-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from a button of one button group to a button of another button group" and *"wherein, when the button to be focused is changed by the inter-group button changing operation unit from the button of one button group to the button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state"*, as recited in exemplary claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 17 and 26.

Gunn discloses a data entry display for a personal computing device. In particular, Gunn discloses a <u>digital keyboard 28, which groups buttons according to frequency of use</u>. The more central the position of a group of buttons, then the more frequently the buttons in that group have been used.

Gunn clearly does not teach or suggest a display control device, which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state.

Indeed, Gunn does <u>not</u> appear to teach or suggest changing a <u>focused state</u> of any button at all, let alone displaying a predetermined button in a focused state when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group.

Furthermore, with respect to exemplary dependent claim 35, the Examiner appears to equate the relative positioning of groups within frequency related circles as disclosed by Gunn with the claimed change of focus. Contrary to this allegation, however, Gunn does <u>not</u> teach or suggest <u>a focusing state that includes a cursor positioned at the button</u>.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action (see Office Action dated August 10, 2007 at pages 20-23) the Examiner alleges that each of the above features is disclosed in paragraphs [0125], [0128], and [0166] of Gunn. The Examiner, however, has clearly mischaracterized the teachings of Gunn.

That is, these passages in Gunn merely disclose a digital keyboard having three rings of characters, where the center ring includes the most commonly used character(s). A user may then use a digital pointer to select certain characters. By providing the characters in the arrangement of Gunn, an amount of movement of the digital pointer may be minimized (e.g., see Gunn at paragraph [0125].

Gunn, however, does not teach or suggest <u>a button change section including an in-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from one button to another within the button group, and an inter-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from a button of one button group to a button of another button group</u>. Indeed, in Gunn, the user merely uses a digital pointer to select a character for entering data.

E.   Results of the Interview:

In response to the arguments presented, the Examiner indicated that he would further review the claimed invention and Gunn in view of the presented traversal arguments.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-36, all the claims presently pending in the Application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the Application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: _December 26, 2007_

Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254